



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/702,184

11/05/2003

Ina Minei

Juniper-26 (JNP-0325)

7526

26479

7590

04/20/2010

STRAUB & POKOTYLO

788 Shrewsbury Avenue

TINTON FALLS, NJ 07724

EXAMINER

BAROT, BHARAT

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2455

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/20/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte INA MINEI, NISCHAL SHETH, PEDRO R. MARQUES, and
YAKOV REKHTER

Appeal 2009-013380
Application 10/702,184
Technology Center 2400

Mailed: April 19, 2010

Before DALE M. SHAW, *Chief Appeals Administrator*

ORDER REMANDING APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was electronically received at the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on July 27, 2009. A Docketing Notice was mailed and Appeal No 2009-013380 was assigned on July 28, 2009. A review of the application has revealed that the application was not ready for an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being remanded to the Examiner. The matter requiring attention is identified below.

Claims 25, 42 and 43 of the instant application contain functional language that may be indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph. *See Ex Parte Rodriquez*, 2009 WL 3756279 (BPAI 2009) and *Aristocrat Techs. Austl. Pty. Ltd. v. It'l. Game Tech.*, 521 F.3d 1328 (Fed Cir. 2008). On September 2, 2008 the Deputy Commissioner for Patent Examination Policy, John J. Love, issued a memorandum entitled “Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, when examining means (or step) plus function claim limitations under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph”, located at: http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/preognotice/section_112_6th_09_02_2008.pdf . Thus, there is a question as to whether claims 25, 42 and 43 and the claims which depend upon these claims, meet the requirements of being definite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the application is remanded to the Examiner to determine if claims 25, 42 and 43 and the claims which depend upon these claims, meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph.

If there are any questions pertaining to this order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

gvw

STRAUB & POKOTYLO
788 SHREWSBURY AVENUE
TINTON FALLS, NJ 07724